



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/679,692	10/04/2000	Glenn Reid	004860.P2475	9006

7590

04/20/2004

Lisa N Benado
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

10

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/679,692

Applicant(s)

REID ET AL.

Examiner

Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment B, filed 12/30/2003.
2. Claims 1-32 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 are independent claims. In the Amendment B, claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 are amended. This action is made non-final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ashe et al (“Ashe”, US 6,307,574).

As per independent claim 1, Ashe teaches a method for producing a graphical user interface, the method comprising:

storing a graphic file having a multiple layer structure and at least one control object, each control object in a separate layer (col. 3, lines 8-12 and col. 6, lines 10-17), and

launching an application program to access the graphic file and to display a control element from the graphic file on the graphical user interface, the control element having at least one attribute dictated by one of the control objects (col. 8, lines 7-33).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Ashe teaches the graphic file has a first control object in a layer dictating one attribute of the control element and a second control object in a separate layer dictating another attribute of the control element (col. 8, lines 22-33).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Ashe teaches the first control object and the second control object share a common name attribute (e.g. *Draw Scroll Background*, *Draw Scroll Thumb*, *Draw Scroll Arrow*; col. 8, lines 12-33).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 2, Ashe teaches the layer of the first control object is grouped with the layer of the second control object as pointed out in col. 8, lines 12-33, e.g. objects under different layers such as *up*, *down*, *left* or *right* are grouped under *Arrow* control element.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, it is inherent in Ashe's system that the graphic file is editable and the at least one control object may be added, deleted or altered.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Ashe teaches the control element is an edit control to manipulate a time-based stream of information (col. 4, lines 44-49).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Ashe teaches the attribute is an appearance (col. 7, lines 4-11 and col. 8, lines 22-33).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Ashe teaches the attribute is a state in a particular environment (col. 8, lines 22-33).

As per independent claims 9, 17, and 25, they are similar in scope to claim 1; therefore, they should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claims 10, 18, and 26, which are dependent on claims 9, 17, and 25 respectively, they are similar in scope to claim 2; therefore, they should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claims 11, 19, and 27, which are dependent on claims 10, 18, and 26 respectively, they are similar in scope to claim 3; therefore, they should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claims 12, 20, and 28, which are dependent on claims 10, 18, and 26 respectively, they are similar in scope to claim 4; therefore, they should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claims 13, 21, and 29, which are dependent on claims 9, 17, and 25 respectively, they are similar in scope to claim 5; therefore, they should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claims 14, 22, and 30, which are dependent on claims 9, 17, and 25 respectively, they are similar in scope to claim 6; therefore, they should be rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claims 15, 23, and 31, which are dependent on claims 9, 17, and 25 respectively, they are similar in scope to claim 7; therefore, they should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claims 16, 24, and 32, which are dependent on claims 9, 17, and 25 respectively, they are similar in scope to claim 8; therefore, they should be rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 12/30/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argued the following:

(a) Ashe teaches where the control objects are drawn by a drawing module, and not displayed from a graphic file.

(b) According to page 13 of the specification, a graphic file may be produced by any multi-layer type computer program for creating and manipulating images on a computer. This differs from hierarchical program code in that the code includes instructions for creating a graphical image according to the parameters of that code. The hierarchical program code used to display a GUI is not a graphical file.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

(a) According to Ashe, in order to display control elements, the application has to access a multi-level hierarchical structure of control objects, which is a graphic file (col. 3, lines 8-12 and col. 8, lines 7-33). By that, Ashe does teach, "display a control element from the graphic

Art Unit: 2174

file". The step of "calling up the appropriate drawing modules to draw each of the elements of a control object" is just an extra step taking place by sets of routines within the multi-level hierarchical structure; therefore, Ashe's teaching mentioned above still reads on claim limitation "display a control element from the graphic file".

(b) As well known in the computer art, "graphic file" is a file used to display graphical features on a display screen. Ashe's hierarchical program code is used to display a GUI; therefore, it must be a "graphic file".

It is further noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "a graphic file may be produced by any multi-layer type computer program for crating and manipulating images on a computer") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Inquiries

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-8318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5:30 PM with every other Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen
April 16, 2004

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100